

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

RYAN WOOD.

Plaintiff,

V.

CLARK W. PATRICK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:16-cv-00538-APG-PAL

ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

(ECF No. 3)

10 On March 16, 2017, Magistrate Judge Leen entered a Report of Findings and
11 Recommendation recommending that I dismiss plaintiff Ryan Wood’s complaint with prejudice
12 because Wood is asserting claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against his criminal defense attorneys,
13 who are not state actors. ECF No. 3. Wood did not file an objection. Thus, I am not obligated to
14 conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring
15 district courts to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified
16 proposed findings to which objection is made”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
17 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings
18 and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise” (emphasis in original)).

Judge Leen correctly states that Wood’s criminal defense attorneys are not state actors when acting as court-appointed defense counsel. *Miranda v. Clark Cnty., Nev.*, 319 F.3d 465, 466 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing *Polk Cnty. v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312 (1981)). There are circumstances when a private actor’s conduct may be fairly attributable to the government. See *Franklin v. Fox*, 312 F.3d 423, 445 (9th Cir. 2002). But Wood does not assert any facts to suggest his defense attorneys’ conduct is attributable to the state.

25 I therefore will accept Judge Leen's recommendation that I dismiss Wood's § 1983 claims
26 with prejudice, but this dismissal is without prejudice to any state law claims Wood may seek to
27 assert in another forum. Without a viable § 1983 claim, Wood does not allege a basis for this

1 court to exercise subject matter jurisdiction in this case. From the face of the complaint, it
2 appears diversity jurisdiction is lacking because both Wood and his attorneys are Nevada citizens.
3 ECF No. 1-1.

4 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Judge Leen's Report of Findings and
5 Recommendation (**ECF No. 3**) is accepted. The complaint (ECF No. 1-1) is dismissed with
6 prejudice with respect to Woods' claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, but without prejudice as to any
7 state law claims Woods may assert in another forum. The clerk of court is instructed to close this
8 case.

9 DATED this 10th day of April, 2017.

10 
11 ANDREW P. GORDON
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28